

### **Remarks**

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on October 3, 2007. In the instant response, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 7-22 have been added. Thus, claims 1 and 6-22 are currently pending.

#### ***§ 102(b) Rejections***

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,956,658 ("McMahon"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a system comprising, in part, a specified data structure comprising "a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field."

McMahon fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. More specifically, McMahon fails to teach or suggest a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field. In contrast, McMahon discloses a handheld data collector 22 coupled to a measurement sensor 26 that is used to collect measurement data at measurement points on the machines. *See* McMahon, Col. 5, ll. 27-65. The sensor 26 is used to measure "acceleration, velocity, volts, pressure temperature, vibration, transducer sensitivity and other data collector settings." *Id.* at Col. 5, ll. 47-50. That is, the McMahon device is limited to collecting physical measurement data using a measurement sensor. Thus, the McMahon device does not have a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field. More specifically, the McMahon device does not have at least one acceptable entry for each field, because the measurement data that is collected by the McMahon device is not identified as acceptable, but rather is simply collected and displayed. *Id.* at Col. 11, ll. 63-65. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by McMahon.

Because claim 6 depends directly from claim 1 and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claim 6 is not anticipated by McMahon.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

**§ 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,688,026 (“Scribner”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,298,333 (“Manzi”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, claim 1 is directed to a system comprising, in part, a specified data structure comprising “a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field.”

Scribner fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. More specifically, Scribner fails to teach or suggest a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field. In contrast, Scribner discloses the use of a portable battery-powered unit to collect data from tagged objects. *See* Scribner, Abstract. That is, the Scribner device simply collects the data programmed into the tag. Nowhere does Scribner disclose, nor could the Scribner device utilize, a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field. Instead, any data structure in the Scribner technology is incorporated into the tag and certainly does not include any acceptable entry for each field. Thus, Scribner fails to teach or suggest a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field.

Manzi fails to remedy the deficiencies of Scriber. Manzi discloses a system having inventory records for each individual item of equipment. However, nowhere does Manzi teach or suggest a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field. More specifically, Manzi does not teach or suggest a data structure that is loaded into a survey device prior to performing a survey and having at least one acceptable entry for each field. Instead, the records are simply updated without the guidance of any acceptable entries. Thus, Manzi fails to teach or suggest a specified data structure comprising a field for each type of expected information and at least one acceptable entry for each field.

Thus, neither Scribner nor Manzi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention of claim 1. That is, neither Scribner nor Manzi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the specified data structure as claimed. Thus, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Scribner in view of Manzi.

Because claim 6 depends directly from claim 1 and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claim 6 is not unpatentable over Scribner in view of Manzi.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### ***New Claims***

#### ***Claims 7-16 Are Patentable***

Because claims 7-16 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 1, claims 7-16 are patentable over any combination of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi.

Further, claim 7 is patentable because it is directed to a system comprising a plurality of acceptable entries for each field from which one of the plurality of acceptable entries is selected for information collected by the mobile survey device. None of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest selecting one of the plurality of acceptable entries for information collected by the mobile survey device.

In addition, claim 8 is patentable because it is directed to a system comprising placing the information in an appropriate field and further identifying the information as one of the at least one acceptable entries. None of the three cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest placing the information in an appropriate field and identifying the information as one of the at least one acceptable entries.

Further, claim 14 is patentable because it is directed to the plurality of steps required to complete a survey, the steps comprising collecting store information, collecting a system identification, and collecting system information. None of the three cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a plurality of steps.

In addition, claims 15 and 16 are patentable because they are directed to the plurality of steps required to complete a survey, the steps comprising collecting store information and collecting on-site refrigerant inventory information. None of the three cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a plurality of steps.

#### ***Claims 17-19 Are Patentable***

It is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art cited in the outstanding Office Action. Claim 17 is directed to a system comprising, in part, collecting information from unaltered and previously undefined equipment to complete the survey of a site.

None of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a system. More specifically, none of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi teach or suggest collecting information from unaltered and previously undefined equipment to complete the survey of a site.

McMahon, as discussed above, discloses a handheld data collector 22 coupled to a measurement sensor 26 that is used to collect measurement data at measurement points on the machines. *See* McMahon, Col. 5, ll. 27-65. As such, the machines in McMahon from which the data is collected must be altered prior to collection of the data to have a measurement point at which the collector can collect measurement data. Further, even if that weren't true, the machines in McMahon must be defined prior to the collection of data. That is, prior to the collection of data, "[a]s the user creates the plant database he also defines the type of measurements required at each point." *Id.* at Col. 5, ll. 45-47. Further, the plant database "is normally updated when new machines are installed." *Id.* at Col. 5, ll. 50-53. Thus, the new machines are defined prior to collection of data and information about the machines are inserted into the database. Thus, McMahon fails to teach or suggest collecting information from unaltered and previously undefined equipment.

Further, Scribner, as discussed above, discloses the use of a portable battery-powered unit to collect data from tagged objects. *See* Scribner, Abstract. That is, the Scribner device simply collects the data programmed into the tag. Thus, the objects are altered prior to the collection of information because they are tagged. Further, Scribner teaches that some information relating to the tagged object can be included in the tag. As such, the object is defined in some fashion prior to the collection of data. Thus, Scribner fails to teach or suggest collecting information from unaltered and previously undefined equipment.

Finally, as also discussed above, Manzi discloses a system having inventory records for each individual item of equipment. Nowhere does Manzi teach or suggest collecting information from unaltered and previously undefined equipment. In fact, Manzi does not teach the use of a collector at all.

Thus, claim 17 is patentable over McMahon, Scribner, and Manzi, alone or in any combination.

Because claims 18-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 17, claims 18-19 are patentable over any combination of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi.

*Claims 20-22 Are Patentable*

It is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentable over the prior art cited in the outstanding Office Action. Claim 20 is directed to a system comprising, in part, a quality control point configured to receive the information collected by the mobile survey device, determine whether information collection has been completed, and subsequently communicate the information to the server.

None of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a system. More specifically, none of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi teach or suggest a quality control point configured to receive the information collected by the mobile survey device.

McMahon, as discussed above, discloses a handheld data collector 22 coupled to a measurement sensor 26 that is used to collect measurement data at measurement points on the machines. *See* McMahon, Col. 5, ll. 27-65. Nowhere, however, does McMahon teach or suggest a quality control point configured to receive the information collected by the mobile survey device. Thus, McMahon fails to teach or suggest the invention of claim 20.

Further, Scribner, as discussed above, discloses the use of a portable battery-powered unit to collect data from tagged objects. *See* Scribner, Abstract. Nowhere, however, does Scribner teach or suggest a quality control point configured to receive the information collected by the mobile survey device. Thus, Scribner fails to teach or suggest the invention of claim 20.

Finally, as also discussed above, Manzi discloses a system having inventory records for each individual item of equipment. Nowhere does Manzi teach or suggest a quality control point configured to receive the information collected by the mobile survey device.

Thus, claim 20 is patentable over McMahon, Scribner, and Manzi, alone or in any combination.

Because claims 21-22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 20, claims 21-22 are patentable over any combination of McMahon, Scribner, or Manzi.

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6-22 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims are respectfully requested. Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at (612) 766-8739.

This response is being filed on or before December 3, 2007, thus making it a timely response. Applicants believe no additional fees are due. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge fees which may be required, including extension fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-0029.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: /Sean D. Solberg, Reg. No. 48,653/  
Sean D. Solberg, 48,653  
612/766-8739  
Customer No.: 25764

Dated: November 21, 2007

fb.us.2384793.01